(XXI Year.) [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 1776. 69

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1776

To the PEOPLE of PENNSYLVANIA.

LETTER VI.

(Concluded from our laſt.)

BUT he has not the candour to compare ſcripture with ſcripture; nor does he give a ſingle paſſage compleat, and connected with the parts neceſſary to explain it—a clear proof that *other craft* may be employed as well as *king-craft* and *prieſt-craft*, in with-holding the ſcripture from the people, even in *proteſtant* countries. Had our author proceeded a little further, or given the different paſſages compleat, as he went along, it would have appeared that, notwithſtanding the juſt diſpleaſure of the Almighty, and his *proteſt* againſt the Jews for throwing off his righteous government; yet, as mercy and forgiveneſs are his chief delight, and he knows there is no perfection in man, the matter was pretty amicably ſettled at laſt; and the divine countenance given to the eſtabliſhment of monarchy, even in the perſon of Saul. God himſelf directed his election and appointment; and to prepare him for his office, gave him *another heart*, and alſo the *ſpirit of prophecy*. As to the thunder-ſtorm, which our author exults in, as an abſolute diſapprobation of all monarchical governments, it was no more than a ſign, called for by Samuel, to convince the people that he ſpoke in the name of the Lord. But what did he ſpeak in the verſes immediately preceding? Not ſurely that God had a particular quarrel with monarchical government, as ſuch, and that "blood would attend it;" but rather the contrary—that ſince the Jews would ſtill inſiſt upon a government of their own appointment, the Almighty would yet give them a bleſſing under that very form, upon condition of their obedience to his law. *If ye will fear the Lord, and ſerve him, and obey his voice, &c.—then ſhall both ye, and alſo the king that reigneth over you, continue following the Lord*; to which duty of *following the Lord*, a bleſſing is always promiſed in ſcripture. But *if you will not obey, &c.*—the hand of *the Lord ſhall be againſt you*; ſo it would have been expreſſed for diſobedience, had they not *aſked a king*. And immediately after the thunder-ſtorm, Samuel confirms this doctrine, and comforts the people. *Fear not*, ſaid he, although you have thus ſinned, *the Lord will not forſake* HIS PEOPLE. *As for me, God forbid that I ſhould ſin againſt the Lord, and ceaſe to pray for you—But I will inſtruct you in the good and right way.* Thus it ſeems a good way was yet to be found, under monarchical government. From all which it is plain, that the Almighty had now pardoned the Jews; and the prophet follows the example; promiſing ſtill to proceed in the diſcharge of his duty among them, as a people yet in covenant with God. But, as I hinted before, it did not ſuit our author's purpoſes to take notice of ſuch paſſages as theſe; and he has been guilty of ſtill as great a perverſion of ſcripture concerning *David*, whom God undeniably approved of and appointed to monarchical rule.

"The high encomium given of David takes no notice of him *officially as a king*, but only as a *man* after God's own heart." I know the poor equivocation which the author has here in reſerve to offer for his ſaying that this character was not given to David *officially as a king*, but as a *man*. It is true, when Samuel firſt applied the character to David he had not yet entered on his *office*, as a king; but it was predicted that the kingdom ſhould not be *continued* in the family of Saul, becauſe he had violated the law, and intruded himſelf into the prieſt's duty, which did not belong to him; and therefore the prophet tells him that the *Lord had ſought him a man after his own heart*, with the expreſs deſign of making him the ſucceſſor of Saul, on account of his excellent and God-like diſpoſition. *The Lord hath commanded him* (this man after his own heart) *to be captain over his people, becauſe thou* [Saul] *haſt not kept that which the Lord commanded thee.* That one man is here rejected from being a king, becauſe of his diſobedience to God, and another choſen as his ſucceſſor, becauſe of his goodneſs of heart and regard to religion, is *true*, or ſcripture is *falſe*. But one greater than Samuel, even St. *Paul*, puts this beyond all doubt; and appropriates the encomium to David, not merely as a *king elect*, but one actually *exerciſing* the *office*. "*When he had removed him* (ſays the apoſtle, meaning Saul) *he raiſed up unto to them David, to be their king, to whom alſo he gave teſtimony and ſaid, I have found David the ſon of Jeſſe, a man after mine own heart, which ſhall fulfil all my will*"; namely, in his character of a king.

Numerous are the paſſages of ſcripture which might be brought to ſhew that the Almighty approved of David *officially* as a king, on account of his public virtues, and that a divine bleſſing was given to the Jewiſh monarchy under his direction. The reader may conſult 2 Sam. chap. v. ver. 10, 12; chap. 8, ver. 6; 1 Kings, chap. viii. ver. 16. Pſ. 78th. ver. 70, 71, 72. Pſ. 89th. ver. 20, 28.

I have now done with our author on this head, and can return one of his polite expreſſions—"I deſpiſe him" equally as a perverter of ſcripture, and of the fundamental principles of mixt government. I am threatened with being "hunted from every lane and lucking hole." *Hunt on.* I ſkulk in no ſuch places, but keep the open ſtreets." "Wait a little," ſay others—"Cato will ſoon be found tripping and ſtumbling upon *Very Doctrine*, the divine right of kings, non-reſiſtance, and the like." Well, gentlemen I *wait* patiently, till it ſo happens; but let me, in the mean time, have fair play. I claim it of the public, as being engaged in a cauſe which is of the utmoſt importance to them as well as to myſelf; and while I handle it honeſtly, I can rely on their candour.

I have got over what ſome may have viewed as the moſt thorny part of my way; and upon the whole I contend for this—*That where a people are left to chuſe their own forms of government, as has been the caſe of all the world for ſome thouſand years, there is no particular denunciation of God's diſpleaſure againſt any* FORM, *whether* MONARCHICAL *or* DEMOCRATICAL, *under which ſuch a people may think their civil happineſs beſt ſecured, and their duty to God beſt performed.*

ACHERLEY ſhall again ſhelter me in this concluſion; which is the main purport of the preſent letter. "JESUS CHRIST left all the potentates of this world, and their ſubjects, to decide their ſeveral rights by the temporal laws of each nation, and never *intimated* WHAT FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS MOST CONVENIENT OR ELIGIBLE."

This directly contradicts our author, who ſays that the Almighty has entered his proteſt againſt the *particular form of monarchy*. Yet ACHERLEY was a GOOD WHIG, and deſired to leave ſcripture out of the inſtitution of modern governments. It might be well for the author of *Common Senſe* to follow the example in his future works, without ſtirring up an old diſpute, of which our fathers were long ſince wearied!

It has been aſked—why does not *Cato* come to the point? *He is but yet in the ſuburbs*—Softly gentlemen! If this be true, why do *you*, who are in the *citadel*, make ſuch a noiſe, and betray ſuch fears? Cannot you let me purſue the ſiege in my own way? I really thought that, if I could ſap or overturn your foundations, the *aerial* part of your fabric would tumble to the ground. You call on me to ſhew my plan? I have done it, and mentioned, as ſuch, a ſafe return to a connection with our ancient friends and kindred, accompanied with all the advantages we have formerly experienced, and perhaps more; which I truſt are things yet *practicable*; or, if it ſhould prove otherwiſe, we can loſe nothing by the exerciſe of deliberation and wiſdom in the mean while.

But what have you done? Although it was incumbent on you to have ſhewn the advantages of your plan, to the great and reſpectable number of good men, who will always be averſe to changes, except in the laſt neceſſity; although you ought to have reſolved their honeſt doubts concerning their future ſafety and peace, which have been plentifully thrown out to you; in ſhort, although you ought to have *counted the coſt of your work*, and have tried to reconcile with your deſign, a multitude of intereſts, *commercial*, *political*, and *œconomical*—you have only entertained us with ſome looſe declamations upon *abuſes* in the Engliſh government, and ſhocked us, for want of better arguments, by a perverſion of things ſacred; filling the papers with perſonal invectives and calumnies againſt all who cannot ſwallow, at a venture, every crude notion you may cook up as the politics of the day. This will as little agree with the ſtomachs of others as with mine: Although I have declared that, when the laſt neceſſity comes, I have no expedient in view but to take my chance with you, for better and for worſe.

CATO.

To the PEOPLE of PENNSYLVANIA.

LETTER VII.

THE author of *Common Senſe* does not truſt wholly to his *ſcripture doctrines* for the demolition of *monarchical government*; and indeed how could he? For he ſeems only to have begun his ſtudy of the Bible "ſince the fatal 19th of April, 1775." Before that period, as he eloquently tells us, "no man was a *warmer wiſher* to reconciliation (with monarchical government) than himſelf." It may be proper, then, to take ſome notice of what he offers by way of argument againſt monarchy, and particularly the hereditary kind.

"If hereditary ſucceſſions" ſays he (meaning ſucceſſion to monarchical government "did enſure a race of good men, it would have the ſeal of *divine authority*." Thus we find him, with his own hand, affixing the ſeal of Heaven to what he has before told us, the *Devil invented*, and the *Almighty entered his proteſt againſt*. A ſtrange inconſiſtency as well as heterodoxy! for if monarchy be from *Hell* and reprobated by *Heaven*, how can a ſucceſſion to it be ſanctified by the authority of everlaſting goodneſs?

He finds another curious argument againſt the Engliſh monarchy, in particular, by tracing it "to the *raſcally original of a French baſtard*. Yet, in the eſtimation of many, this will prove as little againſt the inſtitution itſelf, as it would prove againſt this author's argument or mine, in the preſent controverſy, if both of us were diſcovered not only to have ſprung from *baſtards*, but to be ſuch ourſelves. The *family eſcutcheon*, that is without a blot, muſt be but of very freſh date. The Roman empire, by this author's argument, had a double or *twin-raſcality* in its original. ROMULUS and REMUS did not know their own father "They were, ſays SIDNEY, the ſons of a *nun*, conſtuprated (or plumped up) as is probable, by a *laſty ſoldier*, who was (by the language of flattery afterwards) ſaid to be MARS, and for their vigour and valour were made heads of the people." The reſt of his arguments appear nothing better than theſe, even where he diſplays his whole force, in laying before us the *materials* of the Engliſh conſtitution, under different heads.

"Firſt—The remains of *monarchical tyranny*, in the perſon of the king. "Secondly—The remains of *ariſtocratical tyranny*, in the perſons of the peers. "Thirdly—The new republican materials, in the perſons of the commons. Theſe he intimates, may be *virtuous*; but he ſhould have made them as *tyrannical* as the others, ſo far as theſe colonies are concerned; elſe what are we contending for againſt them?

Alas! what more than *Augean* labour have I undertaken, in attempting to anſwer a writer, who, under the ſpecious name of *Common Senſe*, is conſtantly dealing out paradoxes, and ſetting himſelf up, not only in contradiction to the ſober ſentiments of the wiſeſt of mankind, but often in contradiction to himſelf? Can any man expect credit, who will gravely aſſert that a people, long famed for wiſdom and love of liberty, would have employed themſelves for a thouſand years, in *compounding* and rearing up a conſtitution, out of the materials of the different *ſimple* forms of government, and, all the while, have ſelected nothing but the *tyrannical* remains of each? To reaſon with ſuch a writer would be loſt labour. Some aſſertions are too abſurd for the poſſibility of refutation. The rules of *logic* cannot lay hold of them.

In ſuch a caſe, the beſt anſwer that can be given, is to lay before the reader a true account of the Engliſh conſtitution; the praiſes of which have adorned and filled the volumes of the greateſt men in our own and other countries. In this part of my work, therefore, I ſhall have little more to do than to copy them; and as the ſentiments of foreigners may be deemed more impartial than our own, I ſhall take one of the greateſt of them—the illuſtrious MONTESQUIEU, for my chief guide. But as this truly enlightened genius, with the dignity of a profound lawgiver, delivers himſelf almoſt in the conciſe ſtyle of aphoriſms, that he may be more uſeful to men, whoſe clear and comprehenſive underſtanding renders them fit for the like office themſelves, in the ſervice of their country; I ſhall endeavour to convey the ſubſtance of his doctrines in the moſt familiar ſtyle, retaining, as far as I am able, his ſenſe and ſpirit, I ſhall likewiſe venture ſometimes to make a few additions, either for illuſtration, or to bring his general principles more cloſely home to the Engliſh conſtitution.

There is certainly ſomething too venerable in a *fabric* built up with ſo much care by our anceſtors, cemented with ſo much blood, and to which they have adhered for ſo many ages, to be lightly given up, upon the partial repreſentations, or general invectives, of any writer, or number of writers, arguing from the *abuſe* of things againſt the *uſe* of them. We would not lock ourſelves out of an *old* habitation, till we had provided a *new* and better one; nor part with a common friend, upon the paſſionate accuſations of an avowed enemy, without hearing what he could ſay in his defence, and giving him a fair trial. For, at this rate, we could have nothing of the leaſt ſtability or permanency upon earth; and our whole lives would be employed in making and unmaking, building up and pulling down, without ever reaping the ſmalleſt fruit of our labours.

The author of *Common Senſe* ſtands ſingular in his rage for condemning the Engliſh conſtitution in the lump, and the adminiſtration of it from the beginning. The immortal SIDNEY himſelf gives it a different character, and ſpeaks with reverence of the wiſdom of our anceſtors. "They evidently appear, ſays he, not only to have intended well, but to have taken a right courſe to accompliſh what they intended. This had effect as long as the cauſe continued, and the only fault which can be aſcribed to that which they eſtabliſhed is, that it has not proved to be perpetual, which is no more than may be juſtly ſaid of the beſt human conſtitutions that ever have been in the world. If we will be juſt to *our anceſtors* it will become us, in our time, rather to purſue what we know they intended, and by *new conſtitutions to repair the breaches made upon the old, than to accuſe them of defects that will for ever attend the actions of men.*"

MONTESQUIEU, in the cool moments of philoſophical reflection, unbiaſſed by local prejudices, and remote, both in time and place, from the ſcenes he deſcribes, has given us an inſtructive leſſon on this head.

"A very droll ſpectacle (ſays he) it was in the laſt century, to behold the impotent efforts the Engliſh made for the eſtabliſhment of *democracy* or *republican government*. The ſpirit of one faction was ſuppreſſed only by that of a ſucceeding faction. The government was continually changing. The people, amazed at ſo many revolutions, ſought every where for a *democracy*, without being able to find it" any where. "At length, after a ſeries of tumultuary motions and violent ſhocks, they were obliged to have recourſe to that very government, which they had ſo odiouſly proſcribed."

Every government, in order to be compleat, muſt have within itſelf the power of preſerving its *being*, as well as purſuing its *well being*. And ſuch a power neceſſarily implies three things.—1ſt. *Legiſlation*, or the making laws and regulations for the good of the community. 2dly. The *execution* of theſe laws. 3dly, The *judging* when they are duly executed, and puniſhing offenders. The great object of the whole is *political liberty*, which Monteſquieu defines—"That tranquillity or peace of mind ariſing from the opinion each perſon has of his ſafety. In order to have this liberty, it is requiſite that the government be ſo conſtituted, as one man need not be afraid of another," * either in reſpect of his perſon or property. Every man's own feelings can tell him that this is a true definition.

But the *union* of theſe three powers, the *legiſlative*, the *executive* and *judicial*, in *one* man or any number of men, is not *liberty* but *tyranny* compleat; becauſe there can be no ſafety for individuals in ſuch a caſe, unleſs *goodneſs* were always united with *power*; which is not to be looked for, except under the perfect government of Heaven. "It is a miſtake, ſays the great Mr. LOCKE) to think that this fault (the abuſe of power) is proper only to monarchies. Other forms of government are liable to it as well as that; for wherever the power, that is put into *any* hands for the government of the people, and the preſervation of their properties, is applied to other ends, and made uſe of to impoveriſh, harraſs, or ſubdue them to the arbitrary and irregular

* *Monteſquieu, b. xi. ch. 6.*

commands of those that have it; there it presently becomes *tyranny*, whether those that use it are *one* or *many*. Thus we read of *thirty tyrants* at Athens, as well as *one* at Syracuse, and the intolerable dominion of the *Decemviri*, or *ten men* at Rome was nothing better. *Wherever law ends, tyranny begins.*"

Even the union of but any *two* of these powers, the *legislative* and *executive*, for example, in *one* man, or *body of men*, would leave no chance for *liberty*; because they who make the laws being also to execute them, they would be led to frame oppressive laws, for the sake of the power and wealth which they might derive to themselves, by carrying such laws into execution.

Again, there is no liberty, if the power of *judging* be not separated from *both* the other powers. For where the same persons who make the laws, are either to *execute* them, or to *judge* of their execution; the life and liberty of the subject are wholly at their mercy. These principles are general, and they may now be applied to particular examples.

"In Turkey, these *three* powers are united in the *Sultan's* person, and therefore the subjects groan under the weight of a most frightful oppression."

"In the *Republics* of Italy, where these three powers are united, in a standing body of magistrates, there is less liberty than in our monarchies; meaning those of France, Spain, &c. "Their government is obliged to have recourse to as violent measures for its support, as even that of the Turks---what a situation must the poor subject be in in these republics!" The same magistrates, as a body, are absolute in every thing. By having the execution of the laws, they possess whatever powers they are pleased to give themselves in making them. They may plunder the state without controul. For, they first of all, in the character of lawgivers, appoint what taxes they please; and, being also the executors of the laws, these taxes come into their own hands, and may be put into their own pockets. Being likewise themselves *judges* amidst all these oppressions, no man can have a remedy against them, and "every private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions. Although in such a state there is no external pomp (such as arbitrary princes have) that indicates tyranny or despotic sway;" yet the people know it by a surer mark---"They *feel* it every moment." Even at Venice, where the power of the magistracy is said to be somewhat softened, by having different tribunals erected, which temper each other, there is still this mischief---"that these tribunals are composed of magistrates all belonging to the same body, which constitutes almost one and the same power," unaccountable to any other.

These three powers ought then, for the preservation of liberty, to be lodged in separate bodies, and made to controul each other. Montesquieu adds, that for the greater safety, the *judicial* power ought not to be given to a standing senate; but that the judges should be of the same station as the *accused*; or, in other words, their *peers*---amenable to the law; only its mouth, and guided wholly by its decisions; that, in criminal cases especially; it is proper the person accused should have the privilege of chusing, in some measure, his judges (that is, in our constitution, a *jury*) in concurrence with the law, or at least he should have a right to except against so great a number, that the remainder may be deemed his own choice.

The application of these general doctrines to the English constitution, the corruptions that have crept into it, with the power left in the people for bringing it back to its first principles, and rendering it safer for us than any other we can probably substitute in its room, are important subjects, and too copious to be discussed in this letter.

CATO.

CASSANDRA to CATO.

NUMBER III.

I HAVE engaged in the present political controversy with a design to be of service to my country. On an impartial inquiry into the *present* state of the British constitution, it appears to me that it is out of the power of the British legislature to give us *security* for the future enjoyment of our *rights* and *liberties*, and on this ground I have opposed a re-union. I have examined every thing advanced by you on this subject, and find them wide of the mark. The point with me has ever been, *what will secure our liberties?* The question of interest is ever determined thereby. National prosperity, and national happiness, are incompatible with national slavery. It is of small consequence to America, whether God has granted a king to the people of Britain or not; or whether the constitution of their government answers excellently to the inhabitants of that island, if dependence on that excellent form of government is big with *slavery* and *ruin* to America.

If you mean not to *hold your* countrymen in suspence until the day of salvation is past, I call upon you to prove that Great-Britain can offer *any plan of constitutional dependence* which will not leave the future enjoyment of our liberties to *hope*, *hazard*, and *uncertainty*, as the Forester has finely expressed it. And that if she *can* there is a probability she *will*. If the one is impossible, or the other *altogether* improbable, yourself must acknowledge it is *time to part*.

By the constitution of Great-Britain the present parliament can make no law which shall bind any future one. For as the author of *lex parliamentaria*, or law of parliament, observes, page 77, when treating of the power and authority of parliaments, "Though it be apparent, what transcendent power and authority the parliament hath, and though *divers parliaments* have attempted to *bar*, restrain, suspend, qualify, or make *void*, the power of *subsequent* parliaments; yet could they never effect it: For the *latter* parliament hath ever power to *abrogate*, *suspend*, *qualify*, *explain*, or make void, the former, in the whole, or in any part thereof, notwithstanding any words of restraint, prohibition, or penalty in the former. For it is a maxim in the law of parliament, *quod leges posteriores priores contrarias abrogant.*" Therefore should any parliament give up, renounce, and for ever quit claim to the right of making laws to bind us in any case whatever; yet it can constitutionally stipulate for no longer than that one sitting. They have as full power and authority to revive and enforce the claim at their next sitting as if such renunciation had never taken place. Is it *wisdom* then, or is there *safety* in entering upon terms of accommodation with a power which cannot stipulate for the performance of *its* engagements. If we are foolish enough to do this, must not our *future* security depend entirely on the *will* of a *British parliament*, i. e. of a *British ministry?*

This, in my opinion, must form an insuperable obstacle to reconciliation in the mind of every honest man and sincere lover of liberty on the continent.

A second reason against reconciliation is, that the British constitution is so effectually undermined by the influence of the crown, that the people of Britain have *no* security for the enjoyment of their *own liberties*, and therefore America can never be safe in being dependent on such a state.

The author of "an historical essay on the English constitution," printed anno 1771, says, "I shall not hesitate to date the outline of our constitution from the REVOLUTION. William the Third and his parliament began the practice of restraining the elective power of the people, by the legislative authority. A power that might become ten thousand times more dangerous, to the elective rights of the people, than the crown could ever possibly be. For whenever the active parts of a government, founded upon the common rights of mankind, shall usurp a power to restrain, or destroy those rights from whence they derive their authority, that *state* is *not far* from *destruction*.

"Thus the primary law of our constitution, the first principle upon which it was founded, which had stood the *test* of *twelve hundred years*, and been the *admiration* of ages, was now reduced to the common level of a *nuisance*, to be corrected by acts of parliament. Our legislative authority is, by its own nature, confined to act within the line of the constitution, because it is only vested with a trust by the people, to the end they may protect and defend them in their rights and privileges. And therefore it is a contradiction in terms, to say they have a right to consent to any that may restrain or destroy them. Their consent to this law was a notorious violation of the trust reposed in them." For,

"Upon this principle our constitution may be *one* thing to *day*, and *another* thing to *morrow*. It is *this*, and *that*, or *any* thing that our legislative authority, for the *time being*, shall think *proper* to *make* it." But "the prevailing faction of those days" after sowing divisions among the people to destroy their power and weaken their force, obtained a law under pretence of providing for the distemper of the times, by which they have lost---nay what have they not lost? They have lost the distinguishing character between freemen and slaves! They have lost the distinguishing character of Englishmen! They have lost what the most tyrannical kings of England could never force from them! They have lost, what their forefathers have been spending their blood and treasure to defend, for these thousand years! They have lost the greatest jewel that ever any people possessed! They have lost their constitutional and natural liberty, their birthright and inheritance, derived from God and nature! They have lost their constitutional redress for all their grievances! They have lost their all, their every thing, by that DAMNABLE SEPTENNIAL LAW."

I shall conclude my quotations from this invaluable essay for the present with the following, as perfectly applicable to America, and the foregoing extracts will not only justify but enforce the doctrine it contains, to every honest heart.

"To deduce our rights from the principles of equity, justice, and the constitution, is very well; but equity and justice are no defence against power. You must take your constitutional rights under your own protection, and that *quickly too*, or they will be *lost for ever*. Protect and defend them as the apple of your eye, from danger, or, as you would your wives and children, from destruction: And never desist from using every remedy" in your power, "till you have established them on a foundation never more to be shaken, either by king or parliament." A constitution that affords no check against its own servants, can yield no *security* to us.

He who has the nomination of the officers of government, has the whole power of that government in his own hand, and may do with it as he pleases. This is abundantly proved by the present ruinous state of government in every colony, where the king or a proprietor had the nomination. Liberty will never flourish in such a government. "By the constitution of the Saxon government," says the author first quoted, "no officer, either civil or military, or *even* ecclesiastical, could be invested in his office, or exercise any jurisdiction or authority over *freemen*, without the *free election* of those *freemen* over whom he was to exercise such authority; and it is for this reason, more especially, that the people of *England* were denominated *free*; for that by the ancient laws and constitution of the kingdom, they had this just and natural right, viz. the free election of their magistrates and governors, without which our ancestors thought all our liberties were but a *species* of bondage. For of what use can liberty be to him, whose person or estate is subject to officers, &c. set over him, without his consent." How different from, and how much superior to, our present form of government, was the Saxon, or old constitution of England!

These three considerations form, in my opinion, an insurmountable obstacle against a re-union with Great-Britain. The man who has not thought upon these points, is ill qualified to judge of the necessity of independence, or the inevitable ruin attendant on re-union.

My objections are radical, reaching to the root of the evil, and if a radical cure cannot be obtained in one way, it ought to be obtained in another. To skin over the wound would be madness. I therefore once more entreat you either to point out a compleat remedy for these defects, and prove it more easily attainable than a compleat delivery by a declaration of independence; or to give no further opposition to the measure. He who cannot see a fair prospect of removing these defects, and yet wishes to see America return to a state of dependence, has something else in view than the liberties of his country.

CASSANDRA.

N. B. No good man can agree to any terms which will not give perfect security, and a division must therefore be intended by every man who attempts to prepare the minds of the ignorant and unwary to accept of any thing else. As every writer on the side of dependence has hitherto studiously evaded the point, it appears they design, if possible, to effect a division. Take care, then, ye good people of America, not to be duped by *disinguished* TORIES.

LONDON, Dec. 29.

The substance of lord Shelburne's and lord Mansfield's speeches in the house of lords, on Wednesday, on the third reading of the bill for "prohibiting all trade and intercourse with the twelve united colonies, during the present contest in America, and for empowering his majesty in certain cases, and for the purposes therein mentioned;" with an account of the short debate in which those speeches were delivered.

The order of the day for the third reading of the above bill being read, the bill was accordingly read a third time, and the lord chancellor proceeding to the question:

Marquis of Rockingham. I have a petition in my hand to present to your lordships from the merchants of Bristol, complaining of the hardships they are likely to suffer, should this bill, in its present form, pass into a law. I do not mean to oppose the bill in this stage, but merely to explain a matter relative to the object of this petition. When this petition was offered to be presented in the committee by a noble duke now absent (duke of Manchester) the noble earl over the way (lord Sandwich) rose and observed, that he had a clause which would entirely obviate the apprehensions expressed in the petition. The noble duke, on this assurance, assented; but it has since been discovered, by the friends of the petition, that the amendment proposed by the noble earl, and agreed to by your lordships, by no means comes up to the idea or wishes of the petitioners. It is on that account, therefore, I would recommend to your lordships, before the remedy be out of your power, to bestow some attention to the clause, and as you have declared a desire to relieve the merchants, in every respect, as far as is consistent with the principle of the bill, by giving the clause a review, you will then have it in your power to determine whether or not it shall not, with great propriety, still be permitted to undergo further alteration. The amendment I allude to is, that which fixes the time for ships not immediately coming within the description of this bill, from the first of January to the first of August. As the restraining bills of last year permitted the importation of lumber and other commodities from America into the West-India islands, and as by this bill provisions are made, which entirely alter the nature of that indulgence, and annex different conditions, what will be the consequence, but that goods shipped under the faith of the two restraining acts will be liable to confiscation and seizure, as not knowing that the law has been altered by the present bill? To remedy this evil, this unprecedented hardship and injustice, what I would suggest to your lordships would be, to change the commencement of the operation of this bill from the first of January to the first of March; by which means the people and merchants concerned in the West-India trade will have timely notice of the alteration made by this bill, and, by that means, will have it in their power to prevent the confiscations and seizures which must otherwise be the inevitable consequence of their ignorance and want of information. On the whole, my lords, if any relief be really intended to be given to the trading and mercantile part of this country, no possible objection can be raised to the indulgence now desired; if not, and that the property of the merchants, planters, and others concerned in the West-India trade, is to be confiscated, contrary to the faith of two solemn acts of parliament, the effects of such a procedure must be indeed terrible; and the innocent, as well as guilty, will then have a good cause to be alarmed, finding themselves suffering under the pressure of such a weight of power, breaking into acts of the most wanton violence, and most unjustifiable oppression.

Lord Suffolk. It is somewhat extraordinary that this bill should, in this stage, meet with an opposition, after having been so fully before debated, and every possible objection to it fairly and fully obviated. For my part, I think dispatch is now become necessary; and for that reason, I shall not be for admitting any farther delay. As to the petition the noble marquis now offers to present, I take it to be entirely irregular. His lordship should have offered it before this bill was read a third time. The question now before your lordships cannot relate to any particular clause or amendment in the bill; those are already decided on. The question now is, the bill being already read a third time, whether the bill shall pass.——Here the lord chancellor proceeded to put the question, and the marquis gave the petition to the clerk to hand to the chair.

Lord Weymouth. The question cannot now be postponed, though we were ever so desirous. It is therefore, in my opinion, totally irregular, in this stage of the bill, to offer any matter whatever, but what may go to its total rejection. The matter now urged should have been offered on the report. It is now too late, and consequently I shall be for having the question, now before the house, strictly adhered to.

Lord Sandwich. I differ extremely from the noble marquis in the construction of the clause alluded to. No bill ever passed both houses in a more deliberate manner than the present. It was very maturely considered and debated in the other house. That house shewed every possible inclination to render it as palatable as was consistent with the principle of it, and admitted several alterations, in order to render it inimicous to all those against whom it was not immediately directed. I took the liberty to propose some amendments myself, to render it still less liable to any objection which might be made by such as imagined their property to be affected; yet, after all this candour and concession, to come in this stage to offer fresh clauses and amendments, is, I confess, my lords, what I did not at all look for or expect. I am clearly of opinion, that if the amendments suggested by the noble marquis were to take place, it would, in a great measure, totally defeat the intentions of this bill, because the notice given by the amendment would enable all the parties to ship such quantities of goods under that indulgence, that every substantial operation of the bill would be prevented. If, however, any captures or seizures should happen on that account of the ignorance and want of information of any of the persons actually concerned, it will be a good ground for obtaining such redress as the nature and circumstances of the case may deserve; but for making any amendment, which might open a door for collusion, or for evading the principle or different provisions of this bill, I must fairly own I am totally against it. Besides, of the reasons for the proposed amendment of the noble marquis were much stronger, or would be productive of the equity

ave pointed out; yet, by the eſtabliſhed rules and or-
der of this houſe, it is now too late to make any mo-
tion for altering or amending any of the clauſes of the
bill.

Lord Shelburne. The indulgence your lordſhips ſhew-
ed me on a former occaſion, would have prevented me
from again troubling you on the ſubject, had not I one
or two very ſtrong reaſons. I ſhould have thought my-
ſelf precluded from oppoſing it in this ſtage, after hav-
ing ſo fully expreſſed my ſentiments on the ſecond read-
ing, if I had not looked upon myſelf called to inform
your lordſhips of a particular circumſtance, which has
come to my own knowledge, as well as to ſtate an ob-
jection to the bill, which did not occur to me
when my ſentiments on this ſubject.——
The to inform your lordſhips is, that
a merchant, whom I never ſaw, applied to me, and
told me, that a great number of veſſels were now load-
ing, under the expreſs proviſions of the reſtraining act
of laſt year; that perſons, owners, and proprietors
of thoſe veſſels and cargoes, would be liable to have
them ſeized and confiſcated: this he repreſented as a
grievous hardſhip, as the merchants in America, Great-
Britain, and the Weſt-Indies, were brought into this
very predicament, by the reliance and confidence of a
Britiſh act of parliament. I thought this gentleman
would have acted much more properly, to have applied
to your lordſhips for redreſs; but I nevertheleſs thought
it my duty to mention it, as a matter well deſerving
your lordſhips conſideration.

On a former occaſion, I ſpoke very fully to this bill,
but I cannot avoid mentioning one part of it, the con-
cluding clauſe, which authorizes the crown to delegate
to others the power of pardoning; and I underſtand,
ſince I laſt delivered my thoughts on this ſubject, an a-
mendment has been made to the bill, to prevent any
doubt which might hereafter ariſe by the penning of the
clauſe, of ſuch a right being inherent in the crown ——
I have, my lords, conſulted ſeveral very able and re-
ſpectable lawyers on the ſubject, and not one of them
has acceded to the doctrine in its full extent. I have
looked into ſeveral great authorities, as they lie ſcatter-
ed in books, concerning this doctrine, and not one of
them come up to the language of this bill. One of
them in particular lays great ſtreſs on the ſtatute paſſed
in the reign of Henry the VIIIth, which takes away
this delegated power from the lords marchers, and veſts
it for ever ſolely in the crown. In ſhort, after the beſt
enquiries I have been able to make, I am not ſatisfied
that this claim of delegating the power of pardoning in
the lump is at all inherent in the crown. Some
are of opinion, that this power may be given by
his majeſty to individuals, others in the lump, others in
America only; but not one, that it is inherent in the
crown generally and unconditionally. Informed as I
am, I ſpeak with all poſſible diffidence on a ſubject of
ſuch a nature, and with all poſſible deference to the
judgment of the noble and learned lords preſent, who
declared, when this ſubject was laſt under diſcuſſion,
clearly in ſupport of this power; but yet, after all, I
truſt the noble lords will excuſe me for expreſſing a
wiſh, that a point of ſuch magnitude, a legal queſtion
involving in it ſuch important conſequences, were not
hurried till an opportunity were given to conſider this
matter more fully, at which time a noble lord, whoſe
preſent ſtate of health will not permit him at preſent to
attend, (lord Chatham) may probably be able to deli-
ver his opinion, and this houſe and the nation at large
be ſatisfied that an improper power is not veſted in the
crown by this bill. The Greeks and Romans had ſome
wars of the kind that is now carrying on againſt Ame-
rica by this country. They never gave them the name
of rebellions, nor acted againſt them as alien enemies.
The latter, in one of a ſimilar nature, called it the ſo-
cial war. I call this a conſtitutional war. I ſay this
war is fraught with innumerable miſchiefs.——Inſtead of
exacting obedience, it declares nothing but a wiſh for
ſeparation; it meditates open deſtruction, not coercion.
It goes not to the puniſhment of rebels, and the protec-
tion of the innocent. It is made contrary to every rule
obſerved in commotions of this kind. Inſtead of being
directed againſt individuals, who are the only oſed au-
thors of this rebellion, it is carried on as againſt fo-
reign enemies; war is made on the community at large.
In fine, the principle of the bill is to puniſh the inno-
cent, as well as the guilty. But if the principle of the
bill be bad, the proviſions of it are ſtill worſe. To
carry it into execution, what are you to do? The fra-
mers of this bill, in order to ſtifle and hide the fixed a-
verſion the people in general entertain for its ſervice,
have provided, that the plunder ſhall be ſhared among
the captors, by way of encouragement. What is this
but ſacrificing the merchant to the ſeaman? Again, the
glaring cruelty and injuſtice of ſuch a procedure, have
induced the friends of the bill to admit ſome clauſes, in
order to ſoften the unexampled rigour of the hardſhips
complained of. Thus, on the other hand, the ſeaman
in turn is ſacrificed to the merchant. In ſuch a ſtate
of uncertainty, what are we to conclude from this he-
terogeneous mixture of indulgence and ſeverity, by
which the merchant is neither ſure of his property, nor
the ſeaman of the produce of his capture, when all will
be law, litigation, and confuſion? It directly calls to
my memory the ſtory relative to Sir Charles Wager,
alluded to by a noble and learned lord near the table
(lord Mansfield) who, after taking a very valuable
prize, and having her condemned, when the balance
came to be ſtruck, he found himſelf a conſiderable loſer.
On the whole, I think the principle of the bill wrong,
the proviſions abſurd, oppreſſive, [illegible] and contradic-
tory, and the meaſure taken together in the laſt degree,
haſty, raſh, unjuſt, and ruinous.

Lord Mansfield. I did not come prepared the laſt day
this bill was under conſideration to ſpeak to it, though
I delivered my ſentiments upon ſome matters which
happened then to come into diſcuſſion; nor ſhould I
now trouble your lordſhips, did not I think myſelf call-
ed upon to aſſign my reaſons for aſſenting to it. The
noble lord ſays, this bill is haſty, raſh, ruinous, and
unjuſt. I ſhall beg the patience of the houſe, while I
endeavour to exculpate myſelf from that part of the
cenſure which may be preſumed to fall to my ſhare, as
giving it my ſupport ariſes from the cleareſt conviction
of its utter neceſſity in the preſent ſtate of things. Be-
fore, however, I ſpeak to the principle of the bill, I
ſhall explain one matter which has been frequently
mentioned, it has been aſſerted that one of the clauſes
of this bill has a retroſpective view, as it legalizes all
ſeizures made before the paſſing of this bill. This, my
lord, is not unuſual; it has, indeed, been the conſtant,
uniform practice in ſuch caſes. It is founded in juſ-
tice; becauſe if ſuch ſeizures were made wantonly, as
without cauſe, and not upon the only ground on which
they can be fairly defended, that of manifeſtly advanc-
ing the public ſervice, the clauſe in this bill will not
protect or indemnify any act of that kind. Beſides,
what is the true legal conſtruction of this clauſe?——not,
ſurely, to ſeize the property, and confiſcate it. No, on-
ly to defend the actors againſt perſonal actions, the per-
ſons complaining being ſtill left at full liberty to purſue
their remedy at law, in order to recover their property,
or the value of it. It would, indeed, were it otherwiſe,
be impoſſible for officers in high command to act, if for
meaſures taken for the good of the ſtate, they ſhould be
liable afterwards to be ruined by the almoſt infinity of
ſuits that might be inſtituted againſt them, when the
commotions were over, and every thing returned into its
former tranquil ſtate.—The noble lord ſeems to doubt
of the right of delegating the power of pardoning, to be
inherent in the crown; for my part I think perfectly clear
it has from the firſt eſtabliſhment of the monarchy.
Gen. Gage exerciſed it on a late occaſion, where, by
proclamation, he promiſed pardons to every man in A-
merica, but one or two individuals. It has been always
the practice. Every general of an army, acting againſt
rebels, is veſted with this power. Indeed, I believe,
there never was a rebellion in this country, or its domi-
nions, in which this power was not actually exerciſed.
The rebels taken in 1715 at Preſton, claimed it as an
agreement as the terms of capitulation. It was not
granted, but the power was never diſputed. A night
or two ago I was reading the Regiſter, a book of the
firſt law authority extant. It is full of original writs.
So early as the reign of Edward I. I find this doc-
trine of pardoning in the lump fully confirmed. I
found there a *dedimus poteſtatem*, directed by that king
to certain perſons therein mentioned, to pardon all the
people of Galloway? Was not this pardoning in the
lump? Was not this pardoning a whole community?
As to the original matter that gave riſe to this bill, I
always was of opinion that the people of America were
as much bound to obey the acts of the Britiſh parlia-
ment, as the inhabitants of London and Middleſex. I
always thought that, ever ſince the peace of Paris, the
northern colonies were meditating a ſtate of independency
on this country. They have told you as much in one of
the publications of the continental congreſs, wherein
they thank Providence, in inſpiring their enemies with
the reſolution of attempting to carry their ſchemes of
dominion into effect, till they had arrived at a growth
and ſtrength ſufficient to reſiſt them. I have no doubt
on my mind but this was their intention from the period
I allude to. Whatever might be their wiſhes before
that time, their ſituation rendered it impracticable, be-
cauſe it was this country that could alone protect them
againſt the power of France, to which their whole fron-
tier lay expoſed. But allowing that all their profeſſions
were genuine, that their inclinations were thoſe of duty
and reſpect towards this country; that they entered into
the preſent inſtance at the inſtigation of a few factious
and ambitious men, or thoſe who ultimately directed
them; that the ſtamp-act was wrong; that the declara-
tory law ſhould aſſert the ſupremacy over that coun-
try, but ſhould amount to no more than ſuch a power as
his preſent majeſty exerciſes over the kingdom of France;
that no troops ſhould be ſent into the country, even to
defend them, without their own permiſſion; that the
admiralty courts ſhould never be moved to ſend there,
though by the trial by jury the parties would be judges;
that offenders againſt the laws and authority of this
country, ſhould be tried for offences by perſons who
themſelves were ready to declare they did not think the
charges criminal; that no reſtraints ſhould be laid upon
their commerce, though that great bulwark of the riches
and commerce of this country, the act of navigation,
depended on ſuch reſtraints; that every meaſure hitherto
taken to compel ſubmiſſion to the parliamentary author
rity of this country was cruel and unjuſt, and that every
miniſtry in this country were tyrannic and oppreſſive;
and that the laſt was the worſt of all. Yet, admitting
all this to be true, my lords, what are we to do? Are
we to reſt inactive, till they ſhall think proper to begin
the attack, and gain ſtrength to do it with effect? We
are now in ſuch a ſituation, that we muſt either fight or
be purſued. What a Swediſh general ſaid to his men,
in the reign of Guſtavus Adolphus, is extremely appli-
cable to us at preſent, juſt at the eve of a battle: Point-
ing to the enemy who were marching down to engage
them, ſays he, "My lads, you ſee thoſe men, yonder;
if you do not kill them, they will kill you!" If we do
not, my lords, get the better of America, America will
get the better of us. We do not fear, at preſent, that
they will attack us at home; but conſider, on the other
hand, what will be the fate of the ſugar iſlands, what
will be the fate of our trade to that country? That, my
lords, is a moſt valuable and important conſideration;
it is the beſt feather in the wing of this country. They
are preparing to raiſe a navy; they have begun in part;
trade will beget opulence, and by that means they will
be enabled to build ſhips from foreign powers. It is ſaid
the preſent war is only defenſive on the part of America.
Is that the caſe? Is the attack on Canada, or the attempt
on Halifax, a defenſive war? Is the prohibiting all trade
and commerce with every other part of the Britiſh em-
pire, with Ireland, for whom they expreſs ſuch friendly
ſentiments; is ſtarving the ſugar iſlands acting on the
defenſive? No, though thoſe people never offended nor
oppreſſed us, we will diſtreſs them (ſay they) becauſe
that will be diſtreſſing of Great-Britain. Are we in
the midſt of all the outrages of hoſtility, of ſeizing our
ſhips, entering our provinces at the head of numerous
armies, ſeizing our forts, to ſtand idle, becauſe we are
told this is an unjuſt war, till they have brought their
arms to our doors. The laſt Dutch war was ge-
nerally underſtood to be unjuſt; yet that did not pre-
vent us *from* repelling the invaders, when they came
up to burn our navy at Chatham? The cauſes of the
late war much condemned, but that did not prevent us
from purſuing it with vigour. Indeed the nature of all
war is ſuch, it ought to be carried on with vigour, till
the objects which cauſed it are either obtained, or aban-
doned as unattainable, or not worth purſuing. Neither,
I truſt, is the caſe in the preſent inſtance; I do not,
therefore, conſider who was originally in the wrong;
we are now only to conſider where we are. The juſ-
tice of the cauſe muſt now give way to our preſent ſitu-
ation, and conſequences which muſt enſue, ſhould
we recede from our point of view; I am ſatisfied that it can-
not be properly called either haſty, raſh, ruinous, or
unjuſt.

Capt. Cook, from Belfaſt, informs, that recruiting
parties had been beating up there from September till
January, to reinforce the miniſterial army in America,
but that they had only inliſted ten men. He further
informs, that the miniſtry's plan of ſending commiſſio-
ners to America is dropt.

WATERTOWN, *April* 25.

We hear, that on Wedneſday laſt, the rev. preſi-
dent, fellows and overſeers of Harvard college, waited
on his excellency general Waſhington, with an addreſs,
conferring on him the degree of doctor of laws.

Laſt Thurſday three boats with 26 hands, took a
ſnow bound from Grenada to Boſton, James Cruz,
maſter, and carried her into Cohaſſet. Her cargo con-
ſiſts of 354 puncheons of rum, 49 barrels of ſugar, 10
barrels of coffee, 3 tons of nay, ſome wood, and about
10 barrels of pork and beef, a valuable prize.

HARTFORD, *April* 15.

By a gentleman from Albany, who came to town
yeſterday, we are informed, that all the troops deſtined
for Quebec, who had been detained at Albany ſome
time paſt, not being able to croſs the lakes, had march-
ed for the place of their deſtination. The battalion
from this colony marched on Wedneſday ſen'night;
and the firſt and ſecond battalions of Pennſylvanians,
and the Jerſey blues, on Thurſday, Friday, Saturday,
and Sunday following, and that the general officers,
appointed to the northern department, together with
the commiſſioners from Philadelphia had paſſed through
Albany for Canada.——Nothing material from Quebec.

NEW-LONDON, *April* 19.

Wedneſday laſt, Montfort Brown, Eſq; governor of
New-Providence, Mr. Babbage, ſecretary of that pro-
vince, Mr. Irving, one of the council of ſouth-Caro-
lina, and a number of other priſoners, brought in by
commodore Hopkins, were carried from hence to
Windham, under an eſcort.

The ſame day, the town was alarmed with an ac-
count that four men of war had ſailed from New York
for this place: but as they are not yet arrived, it is be-
lieved they are gone to ſome other port.

NEW-YORK, *April* 25.

Extract of a letter from Philadelphia, April 22.

"This morning we received an account, that capt.
Barry has taken another tender, and ſent her into Egg-
harbour: ſhe is a ſchooner of 6 guns, fitted out by the
Phœnix; ſhe hove her guns overboard and ran aſhore,
but capt. Barry ſoon got her off. The captain got in-
telligence of another tender of 10 guns which he is
gone after. Hope we ſhall ſoon clear our coaſt of thoſe
little pirates who have done much miſchief. The ſloop
Liberty, from St. Euſtatia, ſaid to be bound for Am-
boy, but rather think ſhe was bound to this port, with
powder and dry goods, is taken and carried into Vir-
ginia."

*Extract of a letter from a gentleman at Albany, to his friend
in New-York.*

"I have yeſterday been told, that gen. Wooſter is
gone to Quebec; and that he had ſaid, when he left
Montreal, that he ſhould ſcale the walls of that place,
if there was ſpace ſufficient between them and the
heavens."

On Sunday brigadier general Thompſon ſet out for
Canada, with Paterſon's, Bond's, Greighton's and
Poor's regiments of the continental troops that lately
arrived here from Cambridge.

PHILADELPHIA.

Extract of a letter from Virginia, dated April 15.

"It is certain Mr. Archibald Govan's veſſel, and a
number of Scotch paſſengers, are ſtopped, and the pro-
perty ſeized, chiefly conſiſting of ſpecie, to the amount
of fifty thouſand pounds, which, if condemned, will
be no bad firſt fruits of your reſolution for reprizal.
The veſſel being Govan's, I ſuppoſe will be conſidered
as American property, but the caſh, I take for granted,
was moſtly collected for the principal in Scotland."

A letter from New-York, dated the 24th inſt. ſays,
"ſeventy men came aſhore from the men of war at the
Hook, to get water, but, being attacked by our peo-
ple, they fled into the light-houſe, where they are ſur-
rounded."

Extract of a letter from Peterſburg, Virginia, April 12.

"In my way through Virginia I found the inhabi-
tants warm for independence. I ſpent laſt evening
with Mr. —— from South-Carolina. He tells me
that the people there have no expectation of ever being
reconciled with Britain again but only as a foreign
ſtate. They have formed a government for themſelves.
John Rutledge, Eſq; is appointed preſident, with all
the powers that are veſted in the governor. From ſe-
veral letters I have received from North-Carolina, ſince
that convention have met, I find they are for indepen-
dence, as they either have, or intend to repeal the in-
ſtructions which were given to their delegates, and to
leave them at liberty to vote upon every occaſion, as
they may think proper. Mr. —— was ſome little time
at Halifax, and ſays they are quite ſpirited and unani-
mous; indeed I hear nothing praiſed but Common
Senſe and Independence. The people of North-Caro-
lina are making great preparations, and ſay they are
determined to die [illegible] I aſſure you, my good ſir,
the vehemence of the ſouthern colonies will require all
the coolneſs of the northern ones to moderate their
zeal. I ſuſpected when I was with you, that whenever
they were rouſed, they would go great lengths."

WILLIAMSBURG, *April* 20.

It is reported here that gen Clinton and his troops
are landed at a place called Battery iſland, in North-
Carolina, ſince which a party of them have been de-
feated, and one capt. Collet killed, who had been very
active againſt the inhabitants, and treated many of
them with great ſeverity. It was hoped the Ameri-
can fleet on their way from the ſouthward, would fall
in with the pirates and bloodſuckers on that coaſt, to
chaſtiſe them for their inhumanity; but private letters

from Philadelphia mention their being arrived at New-London, in Connecticut, where they took a tender vessel and several tenders, and obliged the Glasgow and sloop of war to quit her station. The Roebuck has taken two prizes in Delaware bay, which she decoyed within her reach by hoisting a continental union flag, one containing 7000 stands of arms and a quantity of ammunition, the other linens, &c. To counterbalance this disagreeable piece of news, soon after she had sailed with her prizes, a cargo of 1200 casks of gunpowder got safe up to Philadelphia.

The twenty-four regiments that abandoned Boston, according to the regimental return, contained 7559 men, exclusive of staff officers and women, and about 600 in the hospitals. The 63d amounted to no more than 140.

Extract of a letter from Charlestown, South-Carolina, March 16.

"It is generally thought the troops on board the transports at Georgia are to join gen. Clinton in North-Carolina. A number of the militia of this colony are gone to Savannah, where there is very little reason to apprehend another attack. In the late skirmish two of our people were wounded, and five of the soldiers. It is reported that a considerable body of troops is arrived, or daily expected, at St. Auguſtine, from whence they are to march to the back settlements; but little credit is given to this, as it would be almost impossible for an army to pass through a country that is little else than a sandy desert."

Thursday last two tenders met a small vessel at Sandy Point, coming down the river with a load of flour; the people immediately ran her aground, and left her. The tenders continued there throughout the day, and several times attempted to board her, but were as often repulsed by the rifles and musketry from the shore, notwithstanding they kept a constant and heavy fire upon our people with pieces of iron, and a variety of shot, in which one man was wounded, and is said to be since dead. When the tide had set the vessel afloat, they cut her loose, with a good deal of difficulty, and carried her down yesterday morning. It is said the enemy had three men killed.

On Sunday the 30th ult. the sloop Liberty, of Perth Amboy, from St. Eustatia, with 83 barrels of gunpowder, 21 bales of dry goods, and 2 hogsheads of medicines, was taken by a tender, off the capes of Philadelphia, and carried into Norfolk. The captain, and three passengers, are made close prisoners. The mate escaped; he says he was at Antigua, where were 7000 British troops, making preparations to sail to some part of the continent.

ANNAPOLIS, May 2.

The general assembly of this province, which stood prorogued to the thirtieth day of April last, is further prorogued to Monday the third day of June next.

In COUNCIL of SAFETY, *Annapolis, April* 30, 1776.

THE gentlemen who were appointed to collect gold and silver coin are desired to take notice, that we have now received continental money, and that whatever gold and silver they bring in will be immediately exchanged at the treasury.

By order,

G. DUVALL, clerk.

In COUNCIL of SAFETY, *Apr.* 22.

RESOLVED, That there be a *CONVENTION* of the *DELEGATES* of this province held at the city of Annapolis, on Tuesday the 7th of May next.

By order,

G. DUVALL, clerk.

WANTED at Fort Frederick furnace and I.I. Forge in Frederick county, a large quantity of cord wood cut. Any persons that are willing to hire their negroes for that purpose, may know the terms, by applying to Mr. Lancelot Jacques in Annapolis, or to the subscriber living at the works.

3w DENTON JACQUES.

Annapolis, April 18, 1776.

RAN away from the subscriber, an indented servant man, named Philip M'Donald, a barber by trade, born in Ireland, about five feet seven inches high, dark complexion, and black hair tied behind remarkably frizzled, pale faced and pitted with the small-pox, takes snuff in great quantities, and is very fond of liquor: had on when he went away a light gray old coat. He can give no better reason for his elopement than often meriting chastisement and never receiving it. Should he be taken within ten miles twenty shillings reward, within the province forty shillings, and out of the province three pounds currency, and all charges will be paid by

JUSTUS SIEBERT,

Hair-dresser in Annapolis.

The beautiful full-bl[ood] BAY BO[LTON], Full 16 hands high and well formed, a dark bay, eight years old,

STANDS on Constitution-hill, near Piscataway, and will cover mares this season at two guineas, or forty shillings the leap, [paid] when the mare is taken away, or four pounds credit till the first of April 1777, and if not paid in that time to pay interest from the date. I have very fine pasture for mares, and will have great care taken of them, but will not be answerable in case of loss.

EDWARD EDELEN.

I think it needless to describe him as he is generally known; he stood last season at col. John Carlyle's plantation in Virginia. w3

SPRIGHTLY

To be let to mares the ensuing season, at Schoolfield, Prince-George's county.

THE high bred English horse, SPRIGHTLY, full fifteen hands high, rising seven years old, is of a beautiful dark chesnut colour, was got by Wildman's Babram, his dam by Rogers's Babram, his grandam by Sedbury out of lord Portmore's Ebony; is well suited to breed for either the saddle or turf, being remarkably light, and quick in his movements, free from any blemish or incumbrance of gum, and is imagined equal to any horse on the continent, four mile heats at nine stone. He will be let at six dollars, for the season, and half a crown to the groom, and as at so low a rate the cash will be expected before the horse is led out. Good pasture for mares to be had at half a crown a week, or at half a dollar, with proper feeding; and mares above 15 miles distance two weeks gratis. tf

April 16, 1776.

To be sold at public vendue, by the subscriber, on Thursday the 16th day of May next, on the premises, for sterling or current money, at the general exchange,

PART of a tract of land called Duvall's range, conveyed to the subscriber for 276 acres more or less, situate in Anne-Arundel county, on the east side of the north branch of Patuxent river. On this land are two tenements, with plenty of good board, shingle and rail timber; forty acres of good meadow may be made on the said land, with very little trouble; the tenements are in good repair and produce very fine tobacco and Indian corn. Twelve months credit will be given the purchaser, on giving bond on interest with security if required. The land may be viewed any time before the day of sale, by applying to the subscriber.

DAVID STEUART, son of DAVID.

THE noted half blooded horse, Frederick Jones, full fifteen and a half hands high, a fine dapple gray, eight years old, strong, active and bony, stands at Notley-hall, Prince-George's county, and will cover at thirty shillings the season. Good Pasturage for mares gratis. 3w

Bladensburg, April 10, 1776.

RAN away last night from the subscriber, an indented servant named John Teasdale, an English man, about twenty-two years of age, five feet six or seven inches high, well set, of a fair complexion and good countenance, wears his own short strait hair of a dark brown colour, and is by trade a cooper: he had on a blue fearnought sailor's top jacket about half worn, a waistcoat of London brown cloth, and ragged breeches of strong superfine dark drab cloth, a check shirt, and an old small brim'd dirty felt hat bound round the edging with white canvas. Whoever secures said servant and brings him to me shall receive forty shillings reward and all reasonable charges.

w3 WILLIAM SYDEBOTHAM.

April 15, 1776.

ALL persons indebted to George Matthews, late of Kingsbury furnace in Baltimore county, deceased, are desired to make immediate payment, to enable us to execute his will, and all those who have claims against him are desired to exhibit them properly authenticated, to

T. RUSSELL and JAMES SMITH, } executors.

w8

April 10, 1776.

CARELESS,

STANDS the ensuing season at Strawberry-hill, within one mile of Annapolis, and will cover mares at six dollars the season, if pastured; four dollars, if not pastured; or two dollars, the single leap. CARELESS is a fine bay, rising five years, upwards of fourteen hands two inches, and was got by col. Bayly's Fearnought; his dam by Dove, his grand-dam by Othello, his great-grand-dam by old Spark, out of the high bred mare Queen Mab, who was the dam of col. Hopper's Paceler. Good grass for mares. Indian corn will be taken in payment at 2 s. 6 d. per bushel, delivered at Strawberry-hill before the first of July, by

5w THOMAS WILLIAMSON.

P. S. I will be answerable for no mares that may get away.

SIX DOLLARS REWARD.

STRAYED away from the widow M'Donall's, between Baltimore and Annapolis, on Thursday night the 13th of March, out of the fodder house, a bay horse, about 14 hands and an half high, paces, trots, and gallops, marked C S on his left shoulder. Whoever takes up said horse, and brings him to capt. Samuel Maynard's, at Herring-Creek, or to William Hayes, Fell's Point, Baltimore, shall receive the above reward, and reasonable charges paid if brought home.

THERE is at the plantation of Isaac Simmons, near Herring-bay, in Anne-Arundel county, taken up as a stray, a dark bay horse, near fifteen hands high, a star in his forehead, has many white spots on his back, supposed to be hurt with a saddle, a bit of his right ear cut off, his mane hangs on the wrong side, his off hind foot white, shoes on about half worn, branded but cannot make it out. The owner may have him again on proving property and paying charges. w2

JEREMIAH SATCHWELL, [of] Annapolis, to the military gentlemen.

AS the use of arms is become absolutely necessary for the preservation of American liberty, this is to inform the above gentlemen, that he makes all sorts of silver and fine metal sword hilts, likewise cleans and repairs the same. Those gentlemen who please to favour him with their custom, may depend on having their work done with the greatest punctuality and at the most reasonable rate, which he hopes will give satisfaction to the public in general, having served a regular apprenticeship to the said branches in London.

N. B. All sorts of silversmiths [work]

Patuxent Iron-Works, February 6, 1776.

BEING desirous of settling the affairs of our late RICHARD SNOWDEN, late [of] Works, deceased, we request all [persons] to said estate to make immediate payment, as no further indulgence will be given them. Also all persons that are indebted to the Patuxent Iron-Works Company of more than twelve months standing, are requested to come immediately and make payment, and those who have it not in their power to make immediate payment, it is expected they will come and settle their accounts by note or bond. If the above requests are not complied with, we shall take such methods as will compel a settlement, without respect to persons, although it will be disagreeable to

tf SAMUEL and JOHN SNOWDEN.

Just published, and to be sold at the Printing-office

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION OF THE PROVINCE OF MARYLAND, Held at the City of Annapolis, on Thursday the 7th of December, 1775.

PREROGATIVE OFFICE, March 11, 1776.

WHEREAS the records of the commissary's office are removed to Upper Marlborough, by the direction of the Council of Safety for the province of Maryland, I am directed to give this public notice, that the common business of that office will from henceforth be transacted at that place.

And as the commissary's courts are by law appointed to be held at the city of Annapolis, where the suits must indispensably be continued, the commissary general, anxious to relieve as far as in his power the difficulties arising to the people, from the removal of the records to such distance from them, [as] both parties to attend at both places in every [case], which will be on the second Tuesdays of [Sept]ember, and November; and to that end, will hold his courts every second Tuesday in said months in the city of Annapolis, for the convenience of the inhabitants of the Eastern-shore, and others whom it may suit. And he will from thence proceed on the Thursday to Upper Marlborough, there to sit during the remainder of the week for the dispatch of public business.

I also give notice, that for the greater ease and convenience of the inhabitants of Anne-Arundel county, who may have business with me as deputy commissary of that county, I shall give attendance every Tuesday at the house of Mr. Cornelius Carretson in the city of Annapolis for that purpose.

tf ELIE VALLETTE, regist[er]

Wanted immediately, delivered at the contractor's store in Annapolis,

A QUANTITY of potatoes, parsnips, carrots, beans, cockstone beans, or any kind of Indian peas, for which will be given the highest prices, by

ISAAC MACKO,

for Mr. ROBERT CURRIE.

Annapolis, March 26, 1776.

RAN away from the subscriber, an indented servant lad, named Edward Burford, born in Hampshire, about five feet two inches high, fair complexion and brown hair: had with him two cloth coats, one a London brown, the other of a light coloured cloth with waistcoats of the same, much worn, good buckskin breeches, ribb'd worsted stockings and English made shoes. He is very fond of liquor, and can give no better reason for his elopement, than that he often merited chastisement and never received it. He was seen at Mr. Jacob Sampson's in Prince-George's county, pretending leave to visit a ship-mate. Should he be taken 40 miles from home I will give 40 shillings reward on his return.

J. CLAPHAM.

ABRAHAM CLAUDE,

WATCHMAKER, JEWELLER, and SILVERSMITH, Opposite Mrs. Johnson's tavern, ANNAPOLIS,

BEGS leave to acquaint the public in general, and his friends in particular, that he still continues to carry on the aforesaid trades in all their various branches, and at the most reasonable rates; also that he cleans and repairs all sorts of fire-arms, [as] swords, hangers, and cutlasses. He also makes [them] for swords in the neatest and most approved manner.

N. B. He has several [sorts] of hooks and eyes to dispose of cheap.

ANNAPOLIS: Printed by FREDERICK GREEN.